

REMARKS

Applicant deeply appreciates the indication that Claims 2-10 and 12-16 are allowable if rewritten in independent form. Applicant has cancelled Claim 1 and has rewritten Claim 2 into independent form that includes all of the limitations of Claim 1. Claim 11 was amended to depend from allowed Claim 2. It is respectfully believed that Claims 2-16 are now in condition for allowance.

Objection to the Drawings

Applicant has amended the patent specification for consistency so that numeral 53 now refers to "a lift unit" and no new matter is added. The drawings are believed not to require rectification. It is respectfully believed that this will overcome the objection based on the patent specification using differing terminology for this same item.

Paragraphs [0042], [0053] and [0056] were amended to consistently refer to numeral 203 as the "directional switch unit" and numeral 227 as the "push button-type switch." No new matter has been added. It is respectfully believed that drawing corrections are not required.

FIGS. 5 and 10 are amended to show the lower portion of the lower portion 151 of the plunger pin 141. FIGS. 12, 14A and 14B are now corrected to show pin 360 and the contoured portion 365 of the bracket 357. In both instances, no new matter has been added.

FIG. 4 is amended to show only one numeral 27 with the second 27 changed to numeral 37, which is the handle as fully described in Paragraph [0053] of Applicant's Published Patent Specification. No new matter is added.

Therefore, it is respectfully believed that the objections to the drawings are overcome.

Objection to the Specification

In accordance with the Examiner's excellent suggestion, a mere typographical error on Page 8, Line 21 found in Paragraph [0033] of Applicant's published patent application has been rectified. No new matter is added. Also in accordance with the Examiner's excellent suggestion, the Title is amended to recite: "AN APPARTAUS FOR TREATING A FLOOR SURFACE UTILIZING A HANDLE MOUNTED TRAVERSE SWITCH." This title fully comports with amended Claim 2 and is respectfully believed to fully describe the Invention, as now currently claimed.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 112

Claims 11-16 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 112 as being indefinite and for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter that the Applicant regards as the invention. In particular, the terms "the frame" and "the front" appear to lack an antecedent basis in Claims 11 and 14. The term "frame" is now deleted from Claim 11. Claim 11 has been amended to depend from allowed Claim 2. Claim 14 was amended to "a front" rather than "the front" and it is respectfully believed that this rejection is overcome.

Therefore, it is respectfully believed that the rejections of Claims 11-16 under 35 U.S.C. Section 112 are overcome.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 102

Claim 1 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 as being anticipated by Fisher (U.S. Patent No. 5,426,805) and also anticipated by Bartholmey (U.S. Patent No. 6,355,112). Since Claim 1 is now cancelled, it is respectfully believed that this rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 102 is respectfully deemed moot.

Rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 103

Claim 11 was rejected under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 as being unpatentable over Fisher (U.S. Patent No. 5,426,805) and also unpatentable over Bartholmey (U.S. Patent No. 6,355,112). Since Claim 11 now depends from allowed Claim 2, this rejection under 35 U.S.C. Section 103 is respectfully deemed moot.

Amendment A and Response
Inventors: William R. Stuchlik
S.N.: 09/934,141

Therefore, it is now believed that all of the pending claims in the present application, namely, Claims 2-16 are in condition for allowance. Favorable action and allowance of the claims is therefore respectfully requested. If any issue regarding the allowability of any of the pending claims in the present application could be readily resolved, or if other action could be taken to further advance this application such as an Examiner's amendment, or if the Examiner should have any questions regarding this amendment, it is respectfully requested that Examiner, please telephone the Applicant's undersigned attorney in this regard.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: December 8, 2003

Kevin M. Kercher

Kevin M. Kercher
Reg. No. 33,408
Blackwell Sanders Peper Martin LLP
720 Olive Street, 24th Floor
St. Louis, Missouri 63101
(314) 345-6000
ATTORNEY FOR APPLICANT